

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/937,399	MCGARIAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jennifer H Gay	3672	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Jennifer H Gay. (3) _____
 (2) Adesh Bhargava. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 12 July 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.
 If Yes, brief description: Attachment A (copy of amendment filed formally).

Claim(s) discussed: 16-22.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's attorney presented the examiner with amendments to the claims (Attachment A which have been filed formally). After a review of the purposed changes, the examiner informed applicant's attorney that, subject to review by her supervisor, the changes would place the case in condition for allowance when received by the examiner..

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


 Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

*Attachment A*PATENT
ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: 066455-0202

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

Bruce MCGARIAN

Application No.: 09/937,399

For: WHIPSTOCK CASING MILLING SYSTEM

Group Art Unit: 3672

Examiner: J. H. GAY

Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

AMENDMENT AND REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111

In response to the Non-Final Office Action dated April 23, 2004, the period of response to which extends through July 23, 2004, please amend the above-identified application as follows:

Amendments to the Claims begin on page 2 of this paper.

Remarks/Arguments begin on page 5 of this paper.

DC01\81165.1
ID\ABH

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: 066455-0202

Application No.: 09/937,399

Page 2

AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS:

1. (Cancelled)
2. (Cancelled)
3. (Cancelled)
4. (Cancelled)
5. (Cancelled)
6. (Cancelled)
7. (Cancelled)
8. (Cancelled)
9. (Cancelled)
10. (Cancelled)
11. (Cancelled)
12. (Cancelled)
13. (Cancelled)
14. (Cancelled)
15. (Cancelled)

DC01\81165.1
ID\ABH

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: 066455-0202

Application No.: 09/937,399

Page 3

16. (Currently Amended) A whipstock casing milling system comprising: a whipstock having a whipface, the whipface comprising a first ramp surface and a second ramp surface or parallel surface meeting the first ramp surface at a juncture, the first ramp surface being relatively steep compared to the second ramp surface, said surfaces being ramped or parallel relative to the longitudinal axis of the whipstock such that the first ramp surface is disposed at a greater angle to said longitudinal axis than the second ramp surface; a window mill secured to the whipstock adjacent the first ramp surface and operable in use to form an opening in a wellbore casing in which the whipstock casing milling system is located, milling blades of the window mill being directly engaged with and deflected by the first ramp surface laterally into the casing as the window mill is rotated and forced along the first ramp surface toward the second ramp or parallel surface; and a protrusion provided on the whipface, the protrusion forming an extension of the first ramp surface of the whipface and being directly engaged by said milling blades as said milling blades travel along said first ramp surface onto said extension so as to reduce damage to the first ramp surface at the juncture of the first ramp surface and the second ramp or parallel surface during use of the system, the first ramp surface and the extension together forming a mill deflecting slope; wherein the length of the extension being such that, in use, the surface area of the ~~mill~~ milling blades directly engaging said first ramp surface section of said mill deflecting slope reduces as a consequence of the mill moving along and projecting beyond said first ramp surface section of said mill deflecting slope, an increase in stress in said first ramp surface section of said mill deflecting slope due to said reduction in surface area being maintainable below a level which would cause damage to said first ramp surface section of said mill deflecting slope until the mill has moved beyond the relatively steep first ramp surface and is no longer in engagement therewith.

17. (Previously Added) A whipstock casing mill system as claimed in claim 16, wherein a level of stress in said slope which would cause damage to said slope is attained when the mill moves beyond the first ramp surface and is no longer in engagement therewith.

DC01\81165.1
ID\ABH

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: 066455-0202

Application No.: 09/937,399

Page 4

18. (Previously Added) A whipstock casing milling system as claimed in claim 16, wherein the protrusion is provided on the second ramp or parallel surface of the whipface.

19. (Previously Added) A whipstock casing milling system as claimed in claim 16, wherein the protrusion is removably secured to the whipface.

20. (Previously Added) A whipstock casing milling system as claimed in claim 16, wherein the protrusion is removably secured to the whipface by at least one threaded fastener.

21. (Previously Added) A whipstock casing milling system as claimed in claim 16, wherein the protrusion comprises a surface which is ramped at the same angle relative to the longitudinal axis of the whipstock as the first ramp surface.

22. (Previously Added) A whipstock casing milling system as claimed in claim 21, wherein said ramped surface of the protrusion and the first ramp surface are ramped at an angle of 15° relative to the longitudinal axis of the whipstock.

DC01\81165.1
ID\ABH